

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7           **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8           **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
9

10 In Re: NOS COMMUNICATIONS MDL  
11 No. 1357

12 CTA RESEARCH CORP.,

13           Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 AFFINITY NETWORK, INC. D/B/A  
16 QUANTUMLINK COMMUNICATIONS,  
17 INC.,

18           Defendant.

19  
20           Case No. 2:01-cv-00861-LDG (PAL)  
21           Case No. 2:00-cv-01465-LDG (LRL)

22           ORDER

23  
24           Plaintiff CTA Research Corporation's motion to compel responses to Plaintiff's First  
25 Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Defendant Affinity  
26 Network, Inc. d/b/a QuantumLink Communications came on for hearing before the  
Honorable Lloyd D. George on November 22, 2010, at 2:00 p.m. in the United States  
District Court for the District of Nevada, located at 333 S. Las Vegas Boulevard, Las  
Vegas, Nevada.

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, Plaintiff seeks an order compelling  
2 Defendant to provide full and complete responses to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No.'s 1  
3 through 22, inclusive, and Requests for Production No.'s 4 through 6, inclusive. Plaintiff  
4 contends that the information it seeks is relevant to its Truth-in-Billing claim, 47 C.F.R.  
5 §64.2401, in that it seeks information that is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery  
6 of admissible evidence relating to damages that do not run afoul of the filed-rate doctrine.  
7 Specifically, Plaintiff requests that Defendant state with specificity each of the provisions of  
8 its filed tariff that are implicated by telephone calls of differing durations made at different  
9 times to different locations as reflected in its Interrogatories. Plaintiff further contends that  
10 as presently constituted, Defendant's responses are incomplete, evasive, and otherwise  
11 insufficient.


12 Defendant counters that Plaintiff's motion should be denied because Plaintiff seeks  
13 discovery for a claim that is not asserted in its Complaint. Alternatively, Defendant  
14 contends that its responses are nevertheless sufficient because they refer Plaintiff to the  
15 filed tariff, which speaks for itself. Specifically, Defendant contends that the tariff contains  
16 all of the information that Plaintiff seeks and Defendant is legally barred from providing any  
17 additional, different or alternative terms or interpretations.

18 The matter having been argued orally, Plaintiff having submitted a Proposed Order,  
19 Defendant having filed an objection and a Proposed Order,

20 THE COURT **ORDERS** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendant to Provide  
21 Further Discovery Responses is GRANTED (## 199, 207). Defendant is ORDERED to  
22 provide further, complete answers to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory  
23 No.'s 1 through 22, inclusive, and to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production of  
24  
25  
26

1 Documents, Request No.'s 4 through 6, inclusive, and produce all non-privileged  
2 documents requested not later than thirty days from the date of this Order.

3  
4 DATED this 89 day of March, 2011.  
5

6   
7 Lloyd D. George  
8 United States District Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26